

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

v.

Criminal Case No. 13-20512

Terrance Walton,

Sean F. Cox

United States District Court Judge

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

This criminal matter recently came before the Court on Defendant’s Motion for Compassionate Release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). This Court denied that motion in an Opinion and Order issued on October 9, 2020.<sup>1</sup>

Thereafter, Defendant filed another motion continuing to seek compassionate release. (ECF No. 47). Because this Court has already denied Defendant’s Motion for Compassionate Release, the Court construes this *pro se* submission as a motion for reconsideration.

Unless the Court orders otherwise, no response to a motion for reconsideration is permitted and no hearing is held. Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 7.1(h)(3). This Court concludes that, with respect to Defendant’s Motion for Reconsideration, neither a response brief nor a hearing is necessary.

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule 7.1 of the Local Rules of the Eastern District of Michigan, which provides:

---

<sup>1</sup>A copy of that Opinion & Order is attached as Exhibit A, as Defendant’s copy of the Opinion & Order was returned as undeliverable.

(3) Grounds. Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

*See* Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 7.1(h)(3). A motion for reconsideration does not afford a movant an opportunity to present the same issues that have been already ruled on by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication.

After reviewing Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration, this Court concludes that Defendant has not met the applicable standard. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

s/Sean F. Cox

Sean F. Cox

United States District Judge

Dated: January 8, 2021